App. F. IX-4

Previous references

1932.

File No. 62 32

Serial Nos. 1 to 2

Later references

Rev 100 -- 35 - 1 b

" 35 - 7 - 11

175:37-(16)

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. 2

Par B for August 1932

SUBJECT.

Praying for review of the orders passed
thereon regarding acceptance of Pancha
Sthana Puja Tamil family for being used for
the relief of Sri Ramanuja Kaya at Melkote

to Sri Raghavacharya
Archak Sri Bhashyakar
Sannidhi Melkote

Rev-339 of 25 & 31

Whether legal There are no reasons to
interfere with orders already passed

General and Revenue Secretariat

Mug File No. 347 of 1932-3

CHIEF SECRETARIAT 28 JULY 19[illegible] REVENUE BRANCH

(1

[App. F. III—2

Serial No.

Petition of 22/7/32 filed by the N. Rama Iyengar Advocate Bangalore on behalf of his client R. Raghavachar Archak of Sri Bhashyakar Sannidhi Melkote praying for a review of order in Mug appl no 60 of 30-31 in regard to the acceptance of a Panche offered by the Ahobil Jeeyar for being used for the idol of Sri Ramanujacharya at Melkote Nilgiris in P. & D.

Presented by the Rama Iyengar Advocate in the petitioner. He says no Vakalat is produced as this is a Review application and the practice in vogue in the High Court in such cases is adopted.

Now he thinks State the practice followed in such cases. It is usual to demand a fresh Vakalat as otherwise There will be also of Rs 24/- in Stamp Revenue the Colend will be curtailed

28/7 Revenue Branch, collection of Licenses

Read 26/7/32

28/7/32

Rev-Br. in the Complaint

27/7/32

27/7/32

In S.M.S. Please note practice in Rev. Appeals

Ent 27/7 Received 28/7

Separate Vakalat is not necessary when the Review application is presented by the same advocate before the same Court. Sd/-

Ent 28/7.

27/7/32

To Mug Br with Compl to

Ent 29/7

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 70—GBPM—60,000—13-8-31

File No. of 1932 3. General Secr

Mus 347-29-6 relating to the appeal preferred by B. Raghavachariya of Melkote is put up. As to the decision in the case - vide flag B -

The petitioner contends that no definite decision is given as to when the seven days' petition on the day of the celebration of Pavitrotsava of Sri Narayana Swami at Melkote terminate & when the opponent's seven would begin. It is stated that this was not stopped by minor by his counsel at the time of hearing - vide minute of the Hon'ble Member of Council in paras 18 & 29. of the Collection. Subs to orders -

~~[illegible]~~

~~[illegible]~~

~~[illegible]~~

Rejoinder 6 of 32-33

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 42 of 1932 | [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

Which is my appeal No 8 of 30-31? Please let me know

18/8/32

No 8 of 30-31 relates to an appeal preferred by one Pullappa + his son Krishna Reddy of Devanahalli re: The resumption and leasing out of S. No 330 of Devanahalli endowed to Sri Venkataramana temple at Devanahalli + this has nothing to do with the P. W. D. Rejoinder quoted in P. W. D is therefore a wrong one. File relating to P. W. D immediately sent. (Flag B"

18/8/32

Do as revised

18/8/32

16 AUG 1932 GOVT. OF MYSORE AL. & REV. SECTT.

2 No 339 of 29.8.32 to Mr B. Raghavendrachar of Melukote intimating that there are no reasons for a reconsideration of orders already passed in the matter.

Memo No 341 of 29/8/32 to Mr N. Rama Iyengar Advocate. Bangalore City.

B 30/8

No 340 of 29/8/32 to the Deputy Commissioner

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 70—GBPM—60,000—13-8-3

File No. of 193

General
Se



GENL. & REV. SEC. 22 JUL 1932 MUZ

4

Revn 284-32-33

49-32-1

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE, BANGALORE.

Muz. Revision Petn. No. 6 of 1932-33.

Presented by Mr. Rama Iyengar Advocate for petitioner. He says no Vakalath is produced as this is a Revn. application and the practice in Revn. cases in the High Court in such cases is adopted.

22/7/32

B. Raghava Char, Archak of Sri Bhashyakar Samadhi, Melkote. — PETITIONER.

Versus.

1. Asuri Aranganathan, represented by his sons Sampat Kumarachar and Asuri Narayana Iyengar, 118, New Agrahar, Mysore City.

2. Rangamayekamma, of Melkote widow of Periya Nanje Narasimhachariya. — CITIZENS.

The Petitioner abovenamed most respectfully begs that the order passed in Muzrai Appeal No. 8 of 1930-31 be kindly reviewed for the following reasons among

Sent along with that have been produced here

have not been look[illegible] of the learned [illegible] and the order confirming the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

at rest some of the contentions between the parties.

(1) Endorsement dated 26th November 1916 of the French Rocks Deputy Amildar,

(2) Order dated 2nd October 1918 of the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District.

(3) Government Order dated 11th May 1922,

(4) Endorsement dated 4th August 1919.

(5) An application dated 4th January 1917 to the Deputy Commissioner by Asuni - Narayana Iyengar.

(6) Statement of Venkataraji Narasimha char dated 5th February 1917.

(7) Statements of the two parpathegars dated 2nd February 1916.

7. The Petitioner humbly prayed that he and his counsel might be heard before orders were passed in the appeal, and the petitioner firmly believes that if the said opportunity

is

8

had been granted to him he would have convinced about the correctness and truth of his case, and the impugned order would have been passed clearing the points left undecided in that, in favour of the petitioner.

Wherefore the petitioner most respectfully prays that the petition be kindly heard, and the order passed by this Honourable Court be kindly reviewed and a fresh decision granted.

Bangalore,
22nd July 1952.

By Raghavendra Rao
Petitioner
N Rama Iyengar
ADVOCATE FOR PETITIONER.

ಅಷ್ಟ EIGHT'A AS ಎಸ್-೮

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.
* * * * * * *

Appeal No. 6 of 1930 - 1931.

APPELLANT.

B.Raghavacharya,
Archak, Sri Bhashyakar
Sannidhi, Melkote.

VS

RESPONDENTS.

Asuri Anandalwar represented
by his sons Sampathkumaracher,
or Asuri Narasimhengar, 118, New
Agrahar, Mysore City.
2. Ranganayakamma of Melkote,
widow of Periyanmaji
Narasimhacharya.

SUBJECT

Appeal against the orders of the Huzrai Commissioner in Huzrai Appeal 8 of 28-29 on the file of this Court in regard to the acceptance of Panche offered by the Respondents on the occasion of Punarvasu Utsava of Melkote Sri Narayanaswami for being used for the idol of Sri Ramanujacharya.

The case was called on 27th July 1931. The appellant was present and represented by his Advocate Mr.A.Narasimhaswami Iyengar and the first two respondents were represented by Mr.T.Sadagopaswami Iyer, Advocate, Bangalore City.

* * * * * * * * * * *

ORDER. dated 14.4.32.

There are no reasons to interfere with the order passed by the Huzrai Commissioner. The appeal is rejected.

Number of words 157 2 Copies 11

Copying and Comparing } 0-4-8
Charges—
Compared by-gs

5/7/32.
For Secretary to Government
Finance Department

Please quote this number in your future communications,
No. 32 9

Muz Case. one

Office of the .. ~~General and Revenue~~ Secretariat Muzrai Branch

Dated ..27.7./..... .....192 2.
64/

ENDORSEMENT.

To ..Sri B. Raghavachariya
..Archaka of Sri Bhashyakara Sannidhi
Melkote.

Reference:—His/~~Her letter~~/petition dated....2..7..6..32 ....

Subject :—
Regarding grant of a certified copy of the decision in Muzrai appeal No. 6 of 30-31

Reference is invited to item No .1.....below.

Signature. [signature]

Designation. For Secretary to Government of Financial Dept.

---

*1. The request ~~is cannot be~~ granted.. ~~Copy~~ ~~cleared~~ for is annexed to this
The balance of Rs 2-6-4 is returned by money order separately.

2. The letter/petition has been referred to..... ....
for... ....

3. Attention is drawn to this office No..... ... .. dated .. . .

4. No.....dated..... ....cannot be traced; a copy may be sent.

5. The enclosures are not received.

6. The petition is returned herewith as
(i) it is not in the prescribed form
or (ii) it is not duly stamped
or (iii) it is not presented within the prescribed time
or (iv) it is not accompanied by a copy of the order appealed from or complained of.

7. The petition is returned for presentation to ... .

8. The petition is returned
(*a*) as it is written illegibly
(*b*) as its subject matter is not clear
(*c*) as it is couched in improper language.

---

* ~~Reasons if any to be mentioned in brief.~~

WD 01724—GPB—8,000—28 4-28

11

22nd August 1932.

NO. 339/Muzz: 42-32-2.

Granted to Mr.B.Raghavacharya,
Archak of Sri Bhashyakar
annidhi, Melkote.

- - - - - - -

In reply to his petition dated 22nd July 1932 praying that he may be heard and the order passed in Muz.Appeal No.6 of 30-31 (wrongly stated as No.8/30-31 in his petition) reviewed, petitioner B.Raghavacharya is informed that there are no reasons to reconsider the orders already passed.

By Order,

Financial Secretary to Government.

P.D.

G—1]

UBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Misc;

File No. 42-32

Serial No. 2

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No. 339

To

Mr. B. Raghavachariyar.

Avergal Sri Rangaswamy

Sannidhi Mellore.

Subject:— Prayer for ~~decision~~ reviewing the decision in ~~Misc~~ appl no 6 of 30-31. in regard to his ~~certain~~ rights on the occasion of Punavasu Utsava at Srirangam

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Date of issue 29. 8 - 32

S. B. Muddukrishnappa

Signed by .....

Reply to

~~Note referred to~~ this petn of 22/7/32

~~on the above subject has~~

praying that he may be heard and the order passed in

List of enclosures ..... Misc appeal no 6 of 30-31.

(Copy of Misc appl no 6 of 30-31 in this petn)

Renewed petition

Copied by ... ...

B. Raghavachariyar is informed that there are no reasons to reconsider the orders already passed

Examined by .....

B O

Y 18/8.

Bro[illegible]

P.T.O.

· 41- 29.8.32

Copy to Mr. N. Rama

B.A LLB. Advocate Bangalore City

for information.

B.D

18/8

For the Registrar

No.340 dt 29.8.32

Copy to M.C in Continuation of

15'24/ Mis 347-29- b dt 29.4.32

B.D

18/8/32

For the Registrar